

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 589

JC 780 433

AUTHOR Gordon, Helen H.
TITLE The Effects of Affirmative Action on the Role of the Employment Screening Committee.
PUB DATE Jun 77
NOTE 33p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees; *Affirmative Action; Civil Rights; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Employment Practices; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Federal Legislation; Females; *Junior Colleges; Minority Groups; *Personnel Selection; School Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Bakersfield College CA

ABSTRACT

A selected sample of faculty at Bakersfield College was surveyed to determine their perception of the effects of a district affirmative action policy on the role of the screening committee in the hiring process. It was anticipated that many would perceive the role of the committee to have been diminished and would offer helpful suggestions for improving the screening and hiring processes. Thirteen faculty members with screening committee experience responded to a questionnaire that elicited information on number of times served, perception of the committee's importance and factors influencing its role, awareness and understanding of the district's affirmative action policy, views on the affirmative action officer's role, instances when the committee's choice had been disregarded, views on affirmative action orientation and future role, and recommendations for procedure changes in screening and/or hiring. Contrary to expectations faculty saw the committee as very important; they tended to credit increased importance of the committee to affirmative action although some felt it had been misapplied at times. Respondents provided a wealth of suggestions, including two complete models for hiring trades and industry instructors and administrators. Appendices present these models, federal regulations for equal opportunity in education, the questionnaire, and a bibliography. (Author/TR)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED157589

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Helen H. Gordon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE EFFECTS OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ON THE ROLE
OF THE EMPLOYMENT SCREENING COMMITTEE

by

Helen H. Gordon, M. A.

Bakersfield College

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

June, 1977

JC 780 433

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	iii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	3
3. PROCEDURES	7
4. RESULTS	9
5. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
APPENDIXES	
A. MODEL HIRING PROCEDURE FOR ADMINISTRATORS	19
B. MODEL HIRING PROCEDURE FOR INSTRUCTOR IN TRADES AND INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT	21
C. FEDERAL REGULATIONS FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION . .	23
D. QUESTIONNAIRE	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	28

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine how a selected sample of faculty members perceived the effects of a district affirmative action policy on the role of the screening committee in the hiring process. Since on some occasions minorities or women have been hired who were not the choice of the screening committee, it was hypothesized that many would perceive the role of the screening committee as diminished. It was further hypothesized that the group interviewed would offer helpful suggestions for improvement of the screening and hiring processes.

A questionnaire was devised in consultation with the affirmative action officer and administered in personal interviews with thirteen faculty members who had served recently on screening committees for faculty and administration and non-teaching positions. The findings disconfirmed the first hypothesis, revealing instead that the sampled faculty members see the screening committee as very important. Moreover, they tended to credit an increased importance of the screening committee to the affirmative action policy, and all were highly supportive of affirmative action even though some felt it had been misapplied at times.

The second hypothesis was confirmed by a wealth of suggestions for improvement, including two complete models for procedures in hiring an instructor in the trades and industries department and in hiring administrators. Recommendations drawn from the study were that the model procedures developed by screening committees be repeated in future hiring, that the screening committee be considered a full partner in implementing affirmative action, that all members of a screening committee receive explanations if their first choice is not selected, that the affirmative action officer extend his present educational efforts, and that advertising more accurately reflect selection criteria.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The growing equalitarian spirit in the United States has been affecting higher education in various ways, probably permanently. Community colleges particularly are seeking a broader clientele, including women, minorities, aged, and other less privileged groups. As they open their doors wider, however, they must open their hearts and recognize a moral obligation to provide role models for those whose aspirations they seek to raise. Faculty, too, have been growing more equalitarian, wanting a larger voice in policy making, curriculum development, and governance. The aspect of governance this study concerned itself with was that of hiring procedures, particularly as affected by affirmative action regulations. These regulations and laws against discrimination have seemed to be limiting the autonomy of the faculty at precisely the time when they crave more autonomy and less restriction. Hence, some college teachers have perceived affirmative action policies as hampering their own freedoms, diminishing the importance of their professional judgment, or even weakening the educational programs. Others have perceived them as constructive and morally right.

The purpose of this study was to determine how a sampling of faculty members at Bakersfield College perceive the role of the screening committee and the effects affirmative action has had upon it. It was initially hypothesized that a widespread feeling exists that the role of the screening committee has been diminished by affirmative action policies, indicating a need for greater efforts to educate committees about affirmative action.

A further aim of the study was to elicit useful suggestions from those who have recently served on screening committees for improvement of screening and hiring processes.

To achieve these ends, a questionnaire was devised and then further refined in consultation with the affirmative action officer. This questionnaire was administered in personal interviews to thirteen faculty members who have served on screening committees for the hiring of teachers, administrators, and non-teaching faculty. Results were summarized, including recommendations by the respondents for improvement of the screening process, and are detailed in Chapter Four. Two outstanding model procedures for the hiring of an administrator and the hiring of an instructor in the trades and industries department have been detailed in the appendix.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

One aspect of governance which requires close cooperation between administrators and faculty is the hiring process, and that process has grown more complicated since 1964 with the passing of the Civil Rights Act (Title VII), the Equal Pay Act (amended in 1972 by the Higher Education Act), Title IX of the Higher Education Act, The Age Discrimination Act of 1967, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (handicapped) and the Veterans Assistance Act of 1972 (disabled veterans). These federal laws prohibit discrimination in hiring because of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or physical handicaps not related to the ability to do the job.

Though American higher education has always professed to promote democracy and the equalitarian spirit, it has also cherished a strong sense of independence. The nature of the conflict facing the colleges and universities has been well stated by Claude M. Steele and Stephen G. Green:

Higher education finds itself in a dilemma. On one hand it feels that despite the intentions of affirmative action, the program represents a threat to its independence and, at the same time, it recognizes that a failure to comply with the policy could place it in financial jeopardy as well as violate the value of equal opportunity to which, in fairness, it must subscribe.¹

Reporting on a study at a typical large urban university, Steele and Green reached the disheartening conclusion that, despite its better intentions, affirmative action there had functioned essentially as a quota system, because once a department reached its prescribed level of minority utilization, the active search for minority and women candidates was limited to quota maintenance. They further concluded that selection criteria were often shifted

¹Claude M. Steele and Stephen G. Green, "Affirmative Action and Academic Hiring," Journal of Higher Education XLVII (July-August, 1976), 413-435.

in importance depending on the sex or race of the candidate so that the effect was to emphasize liabilities and underplay assets. In short, if this university is as typical as it appears to be, higher education has a long way to go before it exemplifies the equal opportunity which might be expected of a democratic institution.

The effect on students may be incalculable, but some insight has been provided by a poll of 42,000 faculty by the American Council on Education in 1972.² This study concluded that most colleges and universities are relatively nonsupportive of women faculty and women students. Although women faculty tend to affirm women students and men faculty to affirm men students, the disproportionate number of men faculty assures that the views of men dominate the institutional climate. Women students have few role models of the same sex--and these are clustered in the lower ranks without tenure, often underemployed or misemployed with activities that are not professionally rewarding. An exception was found in women's colleges, where even the men faculty were supportive of women, which may be related to the fact that graduates of women's colleges are twice as likely to be cited for career achievement as are women graduates of co-educational institutions.

Another study made in 1972 to determine how extensive sexual discrimination is in the academic world covered 60,00 faculty members in a nationally representative sample of 57 two-year colleges, 168 four-year colleges, and 78 universities.³ Conclusion: sex discrimination is rampant in academe. Though married men with large families were more likely to attain high ranks and salaries, women with large families were not so rewarded.

²M. Elizabeth Tidwell, "Of Men and Research," Journal of Higher Education XLVII:4 (July-August, 1976), 373-389.

³Helen S. Astin and Alan E. Bayer, "Sex Discrimination in Academe," Educational Record, Spring, 1972, pp. 101-118.

And though a doctorate was helpful to both sexes in gaining promotion and tenure, men were likely to be promoted more quickly. Women tended to be more concentrated in teaching, whereas men were more likely to be given administrative and research tasks. Even when women were statistically matched with men for these more rewarded activities, however, their salaries were apt to fall below those of men.

The above articles evidence that the problem of opening up opportunity in higher education is a nationwide problem, and that practices are so entrenched in tradition that the solution may be long in coming.

Another side to the problem, which can be instrumental in its solution, is the greater use of the screening committee in helping to make decisions regarding employment and promotion. Many modern management texts advocate the greater use of the intelligence of subordinate personnel in creative problem solving for the institution they serve. In his classic work The Human Side of Enterprise, Douglas McGregor points out the interdependence of management and workers, showing that higher morale and increased productivity result when workers are given opportunities to share in decision-making.⁴ Andrew Halpin's Administrative Theory in Education discusses educational administration as both a decision-making process and a social process.⁵ An enlightened administrator should therefore be able to use the screening committee as a means of involving faculty and gaining their support for the harmonious implementation of affirmative action policies. The use of more heads should result in more careful selection of new personnel, and committee decisions are more likely to withstand investigations by government agencies or lawsuits by disappointed applicants.

⁴Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960).

⁵Andrew Halpin, ed., Administrative Theory in Education (London: Macmillan Co., 1966).

How has Bakersfield College fared in the process of adjusting to fair employment legislation? This practicum was undertaken to find out how well we are solving the problems, and the findings are encouraging-- greater use of screening committees than ever before, improved procedures since our affirmative action policy was adopted in 1973, and growing support for the principles underlying affirmative action.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

The need for a study of this kind was suggested by a discussion in the first meeting of the Nova cluster group in the governance module. So heated were some of the comments regarding "quota systems" and "reverse discrimination," and so apparent was the need for greater understanding of affirmative action, that the author decided to investigate on her own campus how well the faculty were adjusting to the concepts of fair employment practices. Having heard of one instance on the Bakersfield College campus in which the candidate selected for the position had not been recommended by the faculty screening committee, she decided to confine her investigation to the effects of affirmative action on the role of the screening committee.

The hypothesis was formulated that a survey of ten to fifteen persons who had participated recently on screening committees would reveal a fairly widespread feeling that the role of the screening committee had been diminished by affirmative action policies. It was further hypothesized that those interviewed would volunteer useful suggestions for improving the hiring process.

With these hypotheses in mind, a questionnaire was developed to determine the respondents' attitudes toward affirmative action, their feelings about experiences on screening committees, and their suggestions for improvement. The preliminary questionnaire was further refined by the affirmative action officer, who wanted to know how the respondents perceived the future

need for affirmative action.

The population to be interviewed was selected to make as representative a sampling as possible with such a small number. Though only thirteen persons were interviewed, they had served on a total of 46 screening committees covering administrative, faculty, and non-teaching faculty positions. These positions included counselors, librarian, nursing instructors, business instructors, trades and industries instructors, dean of admissions and records, dean of guidance, institute dean (vocational) and institute dean (academic). Since hiring has slowed considerably in the last five years, the positions named above represent 100% of administrative positions filled in the past two years and at least half of the other kinds of positions.

Limitations were carefully considered. The study was limited to the past five years because the district affirmative action policy did not take effect until 1973. Only faculty members were interviewed, not administrators, so that the study might provide some useful feedback to administration regarding faculty attitudes, though of course no individuals would be named in making a summary of recommendations.

During the time that interviews were taking place, the author read a number of articles and pamphlets to inform herself more thoroughly on the specific laws and executive orders upon which affirmative action policies are based. These readings are noted in the bibliography.

When the interviews were completed, results were summarized. These may be found in Chapter Four.

Conclusions drawn from the findings tended to disconfirm the first hypothesis, revealing instead that Bakersfield College faculty members of screening committees tend to have highly positive attitudes toward affirmative action. The second hypothesis was confirmed, however, and the forthcoming recommendations are itemized in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Following are the results of the questionnaire. (Copy in appendix.)

1. The thirteen respondents had served on a total of 46 screening committees, all of which included interviewing of the candidates.
2. The role of the screening committee was considered "important" or "very important" by 11 respondents, "somewhat important" by 2.
3. All respondents felt the screening committee had grown more important in the last five years.
4. The increase in importance was attributed to the following influences, in descending order of the frequency with which they were mentioned: (a) laws now make it important to back up hiring decisions, (b) increasing tendency for administration to involve faculty in important decisions affecting them, (c) faculty interest in hiring policy and insistence on participation, (d) reduced possibility of error from reliance on the judgments of many rather than one or two persons, (e) jobs now are more technical or greater in scope so committee is needed to judge applicant's training, accreditation, etc., (f) teaching skills, especially important in individualized instruction, are best judged by a committee of persons experienced in teaching that way.
5. None of the respondents considered the screening committee less important than it had been five years ago, but two indicated it needs improvement.
6. All respondents were aware that the district had adopted an affirmative action policy, though two of them did not recall the exact year. They noted the following changes in selection procedures since that time: (a) hiring

procedures have become more visible, more objective, and fairer to all applicants, (b) hiring procedures are now well-defined, well-organized, and more uniform than before, (c) all participants now have a greater awareness of affirmative action policies and greater effort is made to recruit and interview women and minorities, (d) affirmative action has resulted in a broader pool of applicants to choose from, (e) screening committees tend to be larger and more frequently employed in the hiring process, (f) more input from various persons affected, such as vocational and business departments in the hiring of a vocational dean, (g) joint interviews represent an improvement over individual interviews, (h) at first, reverse discrimination hindered vertical mobility for instructors already in the district, but that is less likely now. (As in the previous answer, the items above have been listed in the order of frequency with which they were mentioned; the last response was made by one person only.)

7. Regarding their understanding of affirmative action, 11 respondents said it was "a constructive and necessary procedure to assure that women and minorities have equal opportunity for employment and advancement." Two said they had formerly seen it as a kind of quota system, but now see it as constructive.

8. Regarding the role of the affirmative action officer, responses varied considerably. 1 said "a pointless expense to the district," 1 said "helpful to administrators but not to faculty," 8 said "useful in educating all faculty and administration on the legal intricacies of affirmative action," 8 said "needed to protect the district from lawsuits and/or fines resulting from non-compliance with federal regulations," 2 said the job is necessary, but should be part of a larger job covering all personnel matters, and 2 said he should be better informed, more current, particularly on issues involving sex discrimination. Because some of the respondents gave more than one answer, the numerical total for this question exceeds thirteen.

9. When asked whether they had ever served on a screening committee whose first choice candidate had not been hired, 8 said "no," 5 said "yes," and all indicated that they would feel entitled to an explanation if that should occur. In some cases, more than one candidate had been judged acceptable and the final decision had been left to the college president. The following instances were cited when affirmative action seemed to have a bearing on overruling or influencing a screening committee's choice: (a) in seeking a counselor, the job description and instructions to the screening committee stressed need for expertise in testing; candidates came from New York, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Fresno, and the Bay Area, yet a local Chicano and a local black woman were hired, even though the black woman did not yet possess the required master's degree. The committee's first choice had been a married man with children who had paid his own expenses from New York. (b) in nursing, two candidates (one male, one female) had been recommended for two positions, but in hiring the positions were reversed and the woman given the higher status job. (c) in hiring a vocational dean, the committee recommended a woman because of affirmative action sympathies and excellent qualifications, yet a man was hired; conversely, the next year, the committee recommended a man for dean of guidance and a woman was hired. (d) in the business department and trades and industries, department heads successfully resisted pressure to hire candidates they deemed poorly qualified although they would have improved the percentage of minority faculty members. This success, somewhat ironically, led both of them to support affirmative action more strongly because they no longer saw it as a threat to educational quality.

10. All respondents felt that the affirmative action officer should educate all members of screening committees on such matters as unacceptable inquiries and other legal stipulations.

11. Regarding the future role of affirmative action, 5 said "will be a vital factor in hiring practices for a considerable time to come," 4 said "important for the next ten years but of decreasing importance after that," 1 said "will play a minimal part in overall hiring practices," 1 said the landmark decision by the Supreme Court on the Bakke case will greatly affect the future of affirmative action, and 1 said that the legal sanctions are weak, depend too much on willingness to comply.

12. When asked for suggestions to improve screening and/or hiring procedures, respondents offered a wealth of suggestions itemized below in order of the frequency of mention. Two respondents outlined a complete screening procedure which incorporated many of the suggestions below. These two model procedures are detailed in the appendix.

Recommendations of respondents

The following recommendations were mentioned by four or more respondents: (1) If the person hired is not the first choice of the screening committee, an explanation should be sent to all members of the committee. (2) A uniform set of questions should be given to all candidates. (3) Shorten the interview process to reduce candidate fatigue; joint interviewing by faculty, administrators, and students is preferable to individual interviewing. (4) Separate rating sheets should be kept by all screening committee members on all candidates, and not discussed until all interviews are completed. (5) Strict adherence to job descriptions and deadlines for applications should be observed. (6) Applications should be ranked on a uniform checklist by each committee member prior to the interview.

The following recommendations were made by one or two respondents: (1) All committee members should be present at all interviews to maintain a consistent atmosphere. (2) Screening committee members should be carefully

chosen by the senate or department head. (3) More faculty should be involved in the screening committee experience. (4) In a series of interviews, one person should not ask the same question of every candidate if it is possible to rotate them; although the candidate would not know the difference, committee members may begin to feel redundant. (5) Care should be taken not to give any evidence that a candidate has favor with administrators; this could work against that candidate. (6) Backup to hiring is needed in the form of a strong evaluation system and the courage to fire if necessary. (7) The affirmative action officer should be consulted in the writing of all job descriptions. (8) Screening committees should have a specified weight in decisions so that their recommendations cannot be totally disregarded. (9) Applicants who are not selected for interviews should be notified immediately. (10) Advertising should be honest enough to discourage candidates from coming long distances if, in reality, they have almost no chance of being hired (e.g. a minority person is being sought). (11) Advertise more out of state to enlarge the pool of candidates. (12) Limit advertising to cut down expense. (13) Concentrate on the educational implications of affirmative action—that is, the effect on well being of students and teachers—not just on the rectifying of social injustices. (14) Develop a classification system to clarify affirmative action goals, e.g. on a scale of 1 to 4, 1 is unacceptable and 4 is highly qualified. First priority in hiring would go to 4's who can advance affirmative action goals, second to 3's who can advance affirmative action goals, third to 4's who have outstanding qualifications but do not advance affirmative action goals.

Analysis of the data

1. The initial hypothesis was disconfirmed. Rather than perceiving the

screening committee as less important, a group with wide experience on such committees considered them very important, more so than ever since the affirmative action policy was adopted.

2. The group tended to give greatest credit for the increased use and significance of the screening committee to fair employment laws, though they also cited a growing tendency toward faculty involvement and growing complexity of some teaching jobs.

3. The group demonstrated considerable knowledge, understanding, and support for the principles of affirmative action. Opinions on the value of the affirmative action officer were mixed, though most saw his services as useful.

4. Some tensions have developed in past years between the judgments of screening committees or department heads and the imperatives of affirmative action, but these tensions are being resolved to the satisfaction of most of the group.

5. The secondary hypothesis was confirmed with a rich outpouring of suggestions, many of which are incorporated into the model hiring procedures described in the appendix.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study clearly imply that the dilemma pictured by Steele and Green is a solvable one--the independence of the faculty need not conflict with the authoritarianism of the laws if the faculty perceive the laws to be necessary, fair, and compatible with the objective of educational excellence.

Somewhat to the author's surprise, all the faculty members interviewed expressed strong support for affirmative action principles. None saw it as a quota system or reverse discrimination. Even those who felt that affirmative action had been misapplied in some cases wanted it to work well. Those who had once feared it would limit their choices in hiring now see it as expanding their choices by enlarging the pool of applicants. One interpretation of these findings might be that the persons who serve on screening committees tend to be fair individuals, more likely than other faculty members to be idealistic and willing to serve. Another possible interpretation is that the experiences of serving on screening committees and becoming more enlightened about affirmative action has reduced anxieties about it. Those who served on the administrative selection committee in 1977 were particularly enthusiastic about the group process and felt it was well worth the time it took because it was efficient, fair, and effective. The two administrators selected were a white male and a white female; though affirmative action was considered important, it did not prevail over the desire to hire the best qualified persons.

It would seem wise to repeat a procedure that has worked so well

with the same committee members, but it would seem equally important to expose other faculty members to the positive experiences enjoyed by this screening committee. This study implies that the better one understands affirmative action, the more supportive one becomes. Hence it might be desirable to involve more faculty members in the screening committee experience.

Implications for administration might be that the screening committee is an effective tool in governance. Not only does higher morale result when faculty members are involved in personnel decisions, but the decisions are likely to be sounder ones when the candidate is viewed from different perspectives. In the hiring of administrators, the joint interview seems to work particularly well because the candidate cannot say one thing to a group of administrators and another to a group of faculty. It is recommended, therefore, that this practice be continued.

Implications for students can be logically inferred. If, as Astin and Bayer pointed out in their study on sex discrimination,⁶ graduates of women's colleges are twice as likely to be cited for career achievement as are women graduates of co-educational colleges, the closer we can come to a balanced faculty, supportive of women and minority students, the better we can develop the potential of those students. The more heterogeneous the role-models these students see, the more likely they are to set their aspirations higher.

As for the community and the nation, educational institutions can serve them best when their practices and their faculties reflect the ideals of democracy which they extol. Affirmative action in hiring is a step toward that goal.

⁶Astin and Bayer, op. cit.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were derived from the study. They should have applications to other higher education institutions as well as to the institution studied.

1. Model hiring procedures developed by the administrative selection committee and the trades and industries department should serve as guides to other screening committees in the future. They both incorporate the ideas of strict adherence to job descriptions, adherence to deadlines, consultation with the affirmative action officer, individual ranking of applicants prior to committee discussion to minimize peer influence, use of uniform checklists on applications and uniform questions during interviews. The administrative selection model also recommends the joint interview with faculty representatives and administration representatives both present.

2. Screening committees should be considered full partners in the hiring process, giving input on the job description, being fully informed about equal employment laws, co-operating in the implementation of affirmative action goals.

3. If the first choice of the screening committee is not selected by the administration, each member should receive a full explanation.

4. The affirmative action officer should continue to keep abreast of events and decisions that affect the hiring process. He should orient all screening committee members and, as much as possible, the entire faculty to the scope and limits of affirmative action.

5. Efforts should be made to involve more faculty members in the screening committee experience.

6. Advertisements and job descriptions should be honest enough to discourage a futile expenditure of funds by applicants who must travel long

distances for interviews. Although the law prohibits advertising specifically for a member of a minority race, it is legal to specify that the job requires ability to work well with minority students. It is also legal, and desirable, to state that women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

In addition to the above recommendations by the author, some of the suggestions made by the respondents should be considered. Although some may seem contradictory (e.g.--advertise more; advertise less), these suggestions could have merit in specific cases. All of them showed a concern for the well-being of the college and the students which made the study an exciting and inspiring experience for the author.

APPENDIXES

MODEL HIRING PROCEDURE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

The following procedure was developed in spring semester, 1977, by a screening committee of seven faculty and seven administrators who had two administrative vacancies to fill. This procedure represents an improvement over the past because of clearly defined processes, joint interviews to save time and prevent "tailored" answers, uniform questions asked of each candidate, and sensitivity to affirmative action.

1. President writes job description in consultation with affirmative action officer and other administrators.

2. Position is advertised to all district faculty and as widely as practicable.

3. Deadlines for applications are strictly observed; applicants not meeting minimum qualifications are screened out by president's secretary.

4. Each member of the screening committee examines and ranks applications individually; then group meets, compares rankings, selects top ten applicants.

5. Top ten applicants reviewed by affirmative action officer and assistant dean of development and research to be certain affirmative action guidelines are being complied with.

6. Committee narrows the field to five candidates, invites them to be interviewed, and notifies other candidates that they will not be interviewed.

7. Faculty group formulates questions pertinent to the position; administrative group formulates questions pertinent to their concerns; entire committee meets to discuss the questions; then a representative of each group narrows and refines them.

8. Candidates are interviewed by the joint committee, asking the same questions of all candidates. Interviews allowed $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours each.

9. Following interviews, faculty and administrative groups go into separate sessions and each group determines its top three choices.

10. Combined session is held, each group putting its top three choices in alphabetical order, summarizing positive and negative reactions about each person, reducing to two names which are recommended to the president.

11. Final decision rests with president of the college, but he has heard all the concerns of all committee members. He and the faculty group's chairperson telephone the immediate supervisors of the top two candidates to clear up concerns expressed by the committee.

12. President makes decision; he and the faculty chairperson of the screening committee both report to the Board of Trustees.

MODEL HIRING PROCEDURE FOR INSTRUCTORS
IN TRADES AND INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

The following procedure has been developed by the Trades and Industries Department of Bakersfield College. It has improved the hiring process by making it more objective, more efficient, and fairer, with due consideration for affirmative action.

1. Department chairman writes job description in consultation with lead staff person (expert in the technical field) and affirmative action officer.
2. Department chairman appoints screening committee which reflects knowledge of duties of the job.
3. Committee makes checklist of qualities to be sought for in applicants.
4. Chairman advertises as widely as practicable.
5. Deadline for applicants is strictly observed.
6. Screening committee members individually evaluate each application according to the checklist, awarding points for each item. Results are kept in a locked file in the departmental office.
7. Screening committee meets to rank best qualified and discard ineligible.
8. All qualified candidates are invited for interviews; others are notified.
9. Each committee member prepares five technical questions related to his area, and department chairman prepares from five to ten on philosophy, development, management, and other general aspects of teaching.
10. Department chairman interviews candidate to explain procedure to him, read his questions to him, and rank each answer on a scale of one to five. Candidate has opportunity to ask questions of the department chairman.
11. Committee interviews candidate, each member ranking answers to his own five questions.
12. Candidate takes a written test of 100 objective questions on material students should know after completing his course.

13. Committee reserves the right to ask candidate back for a manipulative examination to demonstrate needed skills, but not necessary so far.

14. Meeting of committee is held to add up all scores and consider comments by other committee members.

15. Candidate is selected and his name referred to the Associate Dean of Instruction.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION

1. TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

What is covered: Discrimination in employment, including hiring, upgrading, salaries, fringe benefits, training, etc.) on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. Covers all employees.

Affirmative Action Requirements: Not required unless charges have been filed, in which case it may be included in conciliation agreement or ordered by the court.

Enforced by: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)

Enforcement Powers: If attempts at conciliation fail, EEOC or the U. S. Attorney General may file suit. Individuals may also initiate suits. Court may enjoin respondent from engaging in unlawful behavior, order appropriate affirmative action, order reinstatement of employees, and award back pay for up to two years prior to filing charges with EEOC.

2. EQUAL PAY ACT OF 1963 (as amended by Higher Education Act of 1972)

What is covered: Discrimination in salaries and most fringe benefits on the basis of sex. Covers all employees.

Affirmative Action Requirements: Not required other than salary increases and back pay.

Enforced by: Wage and Hour Division of the Employment Standards Administration of the Department of Labor.

Enforcement Powers: If voluntary compliance fails, Secretary of Labor may file suit. Aggrieved individuals may initiate suits when Dept. of Labor has not done so. Court may enjoin respondent from engaging in unlawful behavior, and order salary raises, back pay, and assess interest. Back pay may be awarded for up to two years for a non-willful violation and three years for a willful violation.

3. TITLE IX OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972 (Higher Education Act)

What is Covered: Discrimination against students or others on the basis of sex. April, 1977 ruling by district court judge in Detroit limits coverage to students, not teachers, and requires that charges of discrimination be "program specific," (e.g. science, athletics, etc.)

Affirmative Action Requirements: May be required after discrimination is found. Requires self-evaluation, modification, and remedial action to be completed. Assurances sent to Office of Civil Rights by 9/30/76.

Enforced by: Federal departments empowered to extend financial aid to educational programs. HEW's Office of Civil Rights, Division of Higher Education, has primary enforcement powers to conduct investigations.

Enforcement Powers: Government may delay new awards, revoke current awards, and debar institution from eligibility for future awards. Department of Justice may also bring suit at request of HEW (Health, Education, and Welfare). Back pay can be awarded to the extent that employees are covered. Internal grievance procedure is required.

4. AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967, as amended.

What is covered: Discrimination on the basis of age: 40-65.

Affirmative Action Requirements: May be required after discrimination is found.

Enforced by: Wage and Hours Division of the Employment Standards Division of the Department of Labor.

Enforcement Powers: If voluntary compliance fails, Secretary of Labor may file suit. Aggrieved individuals may initiate suits when Dept. of Labor has not done so. Court may enjoin respondent from engaging in unlawful behavior and order salary raises, back pay, and assess interest. Back pay may be awarded for up to two years for a non-willful violation and three years for a willful violation.

5. TITLE VII & VIII OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT, as amended by the Comprehensive Health Manpower Act of 1971.

What is covered: Discrimination in admission of students on the basis of sex and against some employees.

Affirmative Action Requirements: May be required if discrimination is found.

Enforced by: HEW's Office for Civil Rights, Division of Higher Education, conducts the investigations.

Enforcement Powers: Government may delay awards, revoke current awards, and debar institution from eligibility for future awards. Dept. of Justice may also bring suit at request of HEW. Back pay can probably be awarded, to the extent that employees are covered.

6. REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1973, Section 503 (Handicapped)

What is Covered: Affirmative action required to employ and advance qualified handicapped individuals, including hiring, upgrading, salaries, and selection for training.

Affirmative Action: Programs must be prepared and maintained by each contractor of \$50,000 or more with 50 employees. May be integrated with other affirmative action programs.

Enforced by: Office of Federal Contract Compliance of Dept. of Labor.

Enforcement Powers: Government may file suit, withhold payments, cancel contracts, and debar contractor from receiving future financial aid. Back pay can probably be awarded to the extent that employees are covered.

7. VETERANS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972.

What is Covered: Affirmative action required to employ and advance disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam Era, including hiring, upgrading, salaries, demotion or transfer, and selection for training. Also includes section on employment.

Affirmative Action: Programs must be prepared and maintained by each contractor of \$50,000 or more with 50 employees. May be integrated with other affirmative action programs.

Enforced by: Veterans Employment Service of the Department of Labor.

Enforcement Powers: Government may file suit, withhold payments, cancel or terminate contracts, debar contractor from receiving future financial assistance. Back pay can probably be awarded, to the extent that employees are covered.

8. TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

What is Covered: Educational institutions must also obey Title VI of the Civil Rights Act which prohibits race discrimination in education. No regulations or affirmative action guidelines have been issued for Title VI, which has instead been the basis for considerable court action. Also prohibits discrimination on basis or religion or national origin. Applies only to students, not employment.

STATE REGULATIONS COVERING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT

Most states and local governments also have statutes forbidding discrimination in education and employment as well as commissions to enforce those laws. Federal agencies—notably EEOC—defer for a stipulated time to those commissions for investigating complaints brought against employers.

- 31

Questionnaire, continued.

10. Do you think all members of a screening committee should be oriented by the Affirmative Action Officer, or only department chairpersons and administrators?
 ___ All ___ Only chairpersons and administrators
11. What statement best reflects your view of the future role of affirmative action?
 ___ a. will be a vital and important factor in hiring practices for a considerable time to come.
 ___ b. Will be important for the next ten years but have decreasing importance after that time.
 ___ c. Will play a minimal part in overall hiring practices.
 ___ d. Will have practically no effect on hiring practices in the future.
 ___ e. Other. Explain:
12. Do you have any recommendations for changes in procedures of screening and/or hiring policies? If so, explain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Astin, Helen S. and Alan E. Bayer. "Sex Discrimination in Academe." Educational Record, Spring, 1972, pp. 101-118.
- Chait, Richard. "Affirmative Action White House Style," Chronicle of Higher Education, March 7, 1977, p. 40.
- "Federal Regulations for Equal Employment Opportunity," American Association for Affirmative Action Newsletter II, No. 6 (October, 1976), 6-7.
- Fields, Cheryl M. "Anti-bias Safeguards in Title IX Don't Apply to Teachers, Judge Rules," Chronicle of Higher Education, April 18, 1977, p. 3.
- Halpin, Andrew W., ed. Administrative Theory in Education. London: Macmillan Co., 1966.
- McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.
- Moore, William, Jr. Blind Man on a Freeway. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Steele, Claude M. and Stephen G. Green, "Affirmative Action and Academic Hiring," Journal of Higher Education XLVII, No. 4, (July-August, 1976), 413-435.
- Tidball, M. Elizabeth. "Of Men and Research," Journal of Higher Education XLVII: No. 4 (July-August, 1976), 373-389.
- U. S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. "Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures," Federal Register XXXV, No. 149 (August 1, 1970), 12333-12336.
- U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Equal Employment Opportunity Under Federal Law. Clearinghouse Publication No. 17. Government Printing Office, August, 1969.
- U. S. Department of Labor. Women's Bureau. Laws on Sex Discrimination in Employment. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 8 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES